Title: **Reply LS to "Protection of GTP Messages using IPSec"**

Source: **TSG SA WG3 Ad-Hoc**

To: **TSG CN WG4**

Contact Person:

> **Name: Geir M. Køien**

> **email: Geir-myrdahl.koien@telenor.com**

_____

Reply LS to "Protection of GTP Messages using IPsec"

This reply LS is sent by an SA3 ad-hoc meeting and has not been approved by SA WG3 Plenary.

The SA3#15bis ad-hoc thanks CN4 for the LS (N4-000847) on "Protection of GTP Messages Using IPSec".

The SA3 #15bis Ad-Hoc would like to comment on the issues raised in N4-000847.

We completely agree with CN4 that, in general, the use of security protection is an operator option. Indeed, there are countries where use of encryption is forbidden so to require mandatory use of confidentiality protection is clearly not advisable.

It is also clear that operator agreements, bilateral of multilateral, should cover security requirements. Such agreements should cover security for all protocols used for interoperability, but it is not necessarily so that the same policies applies to all protocols. There are several reasons for this, including practical real-world deployment issues of the infrastructure to support secure protocols.

In LS N4-000847, CN4 specifically draws attention to one sentence from LS S3-000607 that has caused some concern in CN4.

"GTP-C protection should be mandatory for TS 29.060 R00, and all releases going forward."

The consensus at the SA3#15bis Ad-Hoc and on the SA3 mailing list is that this is a requirement on the vendor. So all R00(R4) compliant implementations of GTP as defined in TS 29.060 **shall** support IPsec for GTP-C. It is an operator option whether or not IPsec is to be used for intra-PLMN traffic and it is roaming agreemement issue whether or not IPsec is to be used for inter-PLMN traffic.

The SA3#15bis ad-hoc hopes that this clarifies the issue. This response will be forwarded to the SA3 plenary for approval, in Sophia Antipolis (28-30.11.2000).